



The Task Force on Court Facilities
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

South Planning Committees Meeting Report
Wednesday, January 19, 2000 9:00 AM

Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division One
San Diego, CA

ATTENDEES: SOUTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Mr. John Clarke, Committee Chair Hon. Wayne Peterson Rick Dostal for Hon. Charles Smith Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Chair, Task Force GUESTS Judge Stephen A. Dombrink, Alameda Superior Court, Chair, Unification Working Group Mr. John Van Whervin, Los Angeles Superior Court Mr. Ron Guley, Architect, Orange County Superior Court Mr. Peter Conlon, Orange County Superior Court	CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE: Mr. Andrew Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Ken Jandura, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Simon Park, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall TASK FORCE STAFF: Mr. Robert Lloyd, Senior Facilities Planner, AOC Mr. Bruce Newman, Facilities Planner, AOC
---	--

I. COMMITTEE CHARGE

John Clarke welcomed the committee members and thanked them for their attendance. J. Clarke along with A. Cupples, reviewed the agenda and the overall purpose of the committee meeting – to review the findings of the Task Force regarding the current state of courts facilities on a county-by-county basis prior to distribution to the county and local court for review and comment.

II. REPORT OF THE UNIFICATION WORKING GROUP

Judge Stephen Dombrink Chair of the Task Force Unification Working Group presented a Summary of the findings and recommendations of the Unification Working Group, originally scheduled for presentation at the December Task Force meeting in Costa Mesa. The Unification Working Group summarized five main areas where unification may lead to better utilization of facilities. (See attached report). Generally, these recommendations focused on looking how to use each facility based on its physical capabilities, noting that all court building do not have to house all types of functions. The committee generally agreed with the recommendations of the Working Group regarding facility utilization and planning, but questioned the basis for stating that every community of 20,000 should have access to a facility. Judge Dombrink noted

that this also was discussed at length by the Working Group in terms of setting a community size vs. defining travel times etc. The Working Group felt that a combination of these factors should be considered, but felt that access to the courts in smaller communities in some manner was an important criteria for planning.

III. MEETING SCHEDULE

The consultant distributed a preliminary schedule for upcoming Committee meetings and planned surveys and interviews, in order to allow for participation by Task Force members in county interviews. The Committee indicated that they needed more lead time than indicated on this schedule to allow possible attendance at county-wide interviews. Also, they requested that the schedule be simplified and issued on a two-week look ahead basis. The next committee meeting will occur on March 2, in conjunction with the Napa Task Force meeting.

Post Meeting Notes: The schedule has been simplified and is issued by e-mail every Monday. At the North Committee meeting, it was noted that the North and South Committees currently are planned to meet on the same day. Justice Kremer requested that the schedules be revised to allow at large members to attend both meetings if they so choose. Also, it was noted that the August meetings conflict with the Democratic National Convention in LA, and should be revised.

Schedule Revisions will be discussed at the March Task Force meeting in Napa.

IV. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

Los Angeles County – Simon Park presented an update on survey work and findings to date in Los Angeles County. Mr. Park indicated that surveys have been completed on the following facilities:

- South Bay Superior/Municipal Courthouse, Torrance
- South Bay Municipal Court Annex, Torrance
- South Bay Municipal Court Traffic Division Trailer, Torrance
- South Bay Court Jury Assembly Trailer, Torrance
- South Bay Court Beach Cities Branch, Redondo Beach
- Inglewood Juvenile Court
- Inglewood Municipal Court
- Burbank County Courthouse
- Glendale Superior/Municipal Courthouse

Mr. Park focused primarily on existing conditions, noting that the consultant team in conjunction with the court had not yet finalized an approach to county-wide planning re: growth and shortfalls.

John Clarke indicated that with the recent vote for unification, that planning will in all probability follow a district model based on the currently defined districts. The consultant team will set up a follow-up meeting to verify the approach to planning.

Based on information offered in the Los Angeles County presentation, the subject of “trailers” as long term resources for the courts was discussed at some length. On one hand, trailers are not viewed as appropriate or long-term solutions to the courts needs. On the other hand, it is difficult to discount continued use as resources, given the number of trailers used for school facilities and other necessary services. It was agreed that trailers should be evaluated just like other facilities in terms of physical and functional suitability, and that in some cases, the use of trailers or more appropriately modular construction to meet current and future needs in a cost effective manner may be warranted.

Riverside County – Ken Jandura presented the findings to date regarding Riverside County. Mr. Jandura first went through the survey and evaluation findings for each of the 23 existing buildings, noting that the county was also in the process of awarding a construction contractor for an additional facility in the

southeast portion of the county. Mr. Jandura then presented an overview of the findings, comparing the state of exiting facilities to future needs. Currently, the county utilizes 66 Judicial FTE's, with projected future needs in 2020 for 128 Judicial FTE's. The survey identified 92 existing courtrooms (based on finishing-out 8 of the 12 planned for the new SE facility, vs. a need for 128. This difference in judicial positions and available courtrooms exists, because the county and court have not taken older facilities out of service as new facilities have been developed. The consultant presented three options to meet current and projected needs, ranging from maximum reuse/decentralization to maximum consolidation. In response to questions from the committee, the consultant noted that they had worked closely with the court in developing these options and based on the court's relationship with the county, that the options were believed to reflect the best balance of facilities, capital costs, operational costs and service to the public.

The committee suggested that future presentations include an overview of the court and facilities prior to looking at individual buildings in order to put them in context. (This recommendation was followed for the subsequent North Committee presentation with good results).

The committee also asked what the comparative costs of each option were. The consultant team indicated that they had not finalized that information for the presentation, but would complete this effort prior to distributing the data to the county.

The committee concurred with the options as defined by the consultant, but noted that local court and county input was required prior to including any recommendations in the state-wide plan. It was also suggested that given the complexity of the county that it would be advisable to present the findings to the court and county rather than simply submit the report for comment.

VI. CLOSING REMARKS

John Clarke thanked all for their attendance and commented on the value of the committee process and the information presented. Minutes will be issued and posted on the project web site.